

CITIZENSHIP AND GOVERNANCE IN THE EMERGING DEMOCRACIES OF SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Tessy Bakary
Department of Political Science
Laval University

Recent political events in Zambia and in Côte d'Ivoire have been dominated by issues relating to the eligibility for office of a former President of the Republic and a former Prime Minister. The level and the past functions of these two personalities illustrate very clearly the importance of citizenship as a political and social issue in African political systems that in the 1990s have been formally pluralistic and democratic.

Briefly, the attempt to trace the geographic and ethnic origins of their parents in order to challenge the citizenship and eligibility of these two leaders points to dimensions of the phenomenon that are at once spatial (land and territory), social (primary identity or loyalty) and above all historical (the length of time).

Yet the spate of media attention that has been devoted to the careers of these two personalities has done little to shed light on either the historical background or the current importance of the thorny question of citizenship in the midst of the changes now underway in Africa. Nor has it taken account of the extent and the various forms of the phenomenon as it has evolved over time.

Media reports told us nothing, for example, about earlier cases, infinitely more numerous and far less glamorous, involving millions of African men and women who aspired to no public office and yet who have always suffered the same problems, far from television cameras and international radio microphones, weekly press coverage and front-page reports in national and international newspapers.

To top it all off, and perhaps to explain it, the journalistic treatment of the two cases referred to has far from exhausted the subject, and has done little to clarify it.

The emphasis here is on the scarcity, indeed the virtual absence, of knowledgeable analysis about the general question of citizenship, and more particularly about the relationship between citizenship and governance, of a kind that might have helped to guide the study attempted here.

In fact, the approach taken here will consist initially of presenting a theoretical and conceptual framework highlighting the heuristic and explanatory virtues of the concept of citizenship, as summarizing and symbolizing all those more or less profound changes now underway in Africa.

Secondly, it will demonstrate the inadequacy of existing studies on this subject.

AKC 1
321182
B3

Finally, it will investigate the nature of the links between citizenship and governance. More precisely, it would use the concept of citizenship as an analytical framework or *post hoc* tool for analyzing the structural, organizational and functional dimensions of governance.

The paper will also examine the opportunities for action-oriented research that are offered by the relationship between citizenship and governance, and will then group them together at the end of the document.

1. Tracing the social genesis of the concept of citizenship in Africa

In order to understand the dynamic interaction between citizenship and governance in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) and to identify opportunities for research as a strategy in support of action, we must first develop an operational definition of certain concepts from which we can trace the social genesis of the notion of citizenship.

The objective here is to shed light on the dynamics of the social history of citizenship (Tilley, 1996) in SSA, and its modalities of construction, with its periods of retreat under an authoritarian political regime, or of expansion at times of liberalism, pluralism and democracy (Bazenguissa-Ganga, 1997, Otayek et al. 1996).

We shall look initially at the concepts of citizenship and governance. Next we shall turn to a second set of concepts (authoritarianism, democracy, democratization, liberalization, transition, consolidation), in order to capture and express the entire dynamic of the "primary framework" of political interaction (Goffman, 1986: 21-26) and to examine how they impinge, for good or ill, upon citizenship and governance. These concepts make it possible to take account of the context in which the citizenship formation process operates and is constructed and where the practices of good governance are deployed (Hyden and Bratton, 1992, McAadam et al., 1996). We must then place these phenomenon within the long history of African political societies that have been marked since the early 1990s by the abrupt emergence of democracy and that reflect the passage from authoritarianism to democracy (Akindes, 1996, Bratton and Van de Walle, 1997, Chole and Ibrahim, 1995, Conac, 1993, Daloz and Quantin, 1997, Lafargue, 1996, Ninsin, 1998).

The dynamic articulation of tenets, values, beliefs and practices that make up citizenship, with the intrinsic characteristics of the democracies now emerging in SSA, point to some opportunities for action-oriented research.

A. Citizen identity and good governance

The study does not attempt to come up with a definition of citizenship specific to Africa, which would in any case not be valid throughout Africa or would pertain only to a given region of the continent.

We will certainly not attempt to reproduce a definition based purely on Western history (Andrews, 1991, Bendix 1996: 126-166, Kymlicka, 1992a, Tilly, 1996: 1-17, Walzer, 1989) and simply paste it over African realities. The approach adopted is to start from the basic constituent elements of citizenship, which embrace most historical experiences, to suggest a relational approach, relatively flexible, that will allow us to take stock of experience in SSA.

With respect to the notion of governance, we shall start from the most widely accepted definitions, such as those of the World Bank, to highlight certain constituent elements that could be affected by the proposed conceptualization of citizenship.

1. Citizenship as a social construct

Drawing upon Ann Mische's analysis of citizenship and social movements in Brazil (Mische, 1996), on which we have relied heavily for this portion of the study, we need to perform an analytical separation between forms of interaction and their meaning for the players involved. Citizenship, then, will be regarded as a social construct (Escobar and Alvarez, 1992: 89-206), one that is variable or marked by history, consisting of a set of claims or demands, of values and beliefs, but also of particular social relations and goals. "A distinction of this kind induces a dynamic approach to citizenship by allowing us to examine at once changes in the structure of civic relationships and the emerging cultural categories of understanding that inform and are informed by the processes of political restructuring" (Mische, 1996: 134).

Next, starting with the pioneering work of T. H Marshall and of Almond and Verba, we will characterize citizenship in an ideal-typical way, by its legal and cultural foundations. In other words, initially in terms of rights (civil, political and social) institutionalized and guaranteed by the state to all members of a political community (Marshall, 1950, Glazer, 1978). Secondly, as a set of individual attitudes and/or shared values (solidarity, responsibility, trust, tolerance) that underlie participation in democratic institutions. (Almond and Verba, 1963, Diamond, 1993, Inglehart, 1990, 1997, Przeworski et al., 1999, Putnam, 1993)

On the basis of the foregoing, citizenship is the road that leads to the public space of social recognition (Deng, 1995, Johnston and Klandermans, 1995, Mead, 1986, Morris and McClurg Mueller, 1992, Oberschall, 1995, Phillips, 1991) and influence (on the basis of various interests, universal or individual, and for differing objectives), of the various forms of mobilization. Examples are the various social movements, the bread riots (Zghal, 1995), the "national conferences" (Eboussi Boulaga, 1993) that have contributed to displacing the frontiers of politics (Dalton and Kuechler, 1990, Tilley 1978) in Africa. It is the place where different demands meet, a place of struggle and alliances, of deploying various strategies (Escobar and Alvarez, 1992, Gamson, 1990, Tarrow, 1994, Zald and McCarthy, 1987, Zimmermann, 1983), of mobilizing differentiated resources, a place where players fight each other at the same time for procedural space (new political and administrative institutions, transparent elections, etc.,) and influence (better

representation for minorities, for women, for young people within the state and social decision-making processes)(Gurr, 1993).

The question is not to determine who is legally a citizen, but rather to highlight the modalities of social practices, of transactions between the State and social players that give the concept of citizenship its full meaning. What we need, then, leaving aside rights and values as such, is to examine the way in which social relationships are articulated at specific moments and places, through historically constructed modes of appealing to values and rights (Daloz and Quantin, 1997, Lafargue, 1996).

The importance of the concept of citizenship in societies in transition such as those of SSA lies not in its universality, but rather in its ambiguity and multiple meanings. It draws its dynamism from its capacity to construct social relations and to provide a support and a bridge between emerging goals and identities within society.

2. Governance

The notion of governance is rather complex to define (Hyden and Bratton, 1992, Zartman 1997). Using the World Bank's terminology, the term serves to underline the use of political authority and the exercise of powers of control in society in relation to the management of its resources, in order to promote economic and social development.

This broad definition includes the role of political authorities in creating an environment in which economic operators can function, and in determining the system of allocating benefits, as well as the nature of relations between governors and the governed.

Three aspects of governance are often highlighted:

- The form of the political regime.
- The processes by which authority is exercised in the management of a country's economic and social resources.
- The capacity of government to formulate and to implement public policies and to carry out its duties.

Robert Charlick, in a report to the African Bureau of USAID, describes governance as "the transparent and impartial management of public affairs by implementing a regime (a set of rules) recognized as legitimate, in order to promote and reinforce social values desired by individuals and by groups". (Charlick 1992: 2).

On the basis of this conceptualization, we can identify the six following elements of good governance (Charlick, 1992: 9-17):

- a) The legitimacy of authority: the people must recognize and accept the rules so that they will submit to them voluntarily.
- b) Responsiveness to public expectations: the people and public players receive incentives to continue to accept the rules of the game.

- c) Accountability: reinforcing the idea that there are consequences entailed in violating the rules, even for the authorities themselves.
- d) Tolerance of other players with public dimensions: allowing all people to participate in the management of public affairs, without fear.
- e) Freedom of information: allowing people to participate in a meaningful way in public life and giving them the means to implement mechanisms whereby rulers are held responsible for their actions, by ensuring that the public has adequate access to information.
- f) Efficiency in public management: inspiring the public to believe that those in power are using the resources at their disposal in the best way possible to deal with public problems.

This representation of the criteria for governance, taken together with what was said above, poses the fundamental problem of the relationship between citizenship and good governance, a point that will be dealt with further below.

Meanwhile, it is useful to present the sociopolitical context of the interaction of citizenship and governance, which will allow us to delineate and characterize the definition of a set of concepts.

In other words, are their links between citizenship and governance, and if so of what kind? Can citizenship contribute to good governance, and how? If so, under what specific forms, and how can these be developed and reinforced? Is the reverse not also imaginable, i.e. that good governance is the best means for reinforcing or expanding citizenship, hence the dialectical nature of the relationship between the two? In this case, how can we develop and consolidate practices conducive to sound governance?

What are the opportunities for action-oriented research that might result from an analysis of the relations between citizenship and governance?

Before attempting to answer these questions, we must first investigate the sociopolitical context of the interaction between citizenship and governance, in order to delineate and characterize the definition of a set of concepts.

B. The primary framework of interaction

There are six concepts currently used to explain the social and political transformations underway on the continent that can help us to delineate the space-time parameters in which the elements of governance operate and in which the tenets, values, rights and social relationships characteristic of citizenship are articulated.

1. Authoritarianism

Juan Linz proposes a generic definition of authoritarianism, as a form of government "with limited pluralism" (Linz, 1964: 291-341). It suggests a form of collective dictatorship or oligarchy in the exercise of power, civil or military, but in fact supreme

power can be exercised by a single person, as was generally the case in Africa. This regime or way of exercising power is characterized by the abuse of authority "at least in terms of contemporary sensitivities in the West and the practices of government that are valued there. More precisely, authoritarianism designates the kind of relationship between governors and governed that relies more or less permanently on force rather than on persuasion. It is also a political relationship in which the recruitment of leaders relies on co-opting them, rather than on the electoral competition of candidates for political office" (Hermet, 1985: 270).

In terms of rights, values and social and civic relationships as well, citizenship has experienced periods of retreat, to a greater and lesser extent, in authoritarian settings, civilian or military (South Africa during apartheid, Benin under Kérékou I, Guinea under Sékou Touré, Equatorial Guinea under Macias Nguema, Malawi under Kamuzu Banda, etc.). These episodes deserve in-depth empirical research that would allow us to gauge the degree of alienation, of depoliticization, of disengagement of the State, of tendencies to apathy, to cynicism or to revolt, etc. Such studies would constitute a solid empirical foundation for elaborating strategies to restore trust between social actors, to mobilize them once again, to reconcile them with the State, justice (resort to the courts), politics, empowerment, in short to foster the rebirth of the Citizen.

2. Democracy

Democracy, the final end or goal declared and desired by political players, must in this age of "democratic confusion" (Giovanni Sartori) be understood as a principle of political legitimacy, i.e. a set of ideals and a political system or set of institutions, in which "all adult members of the population can act as citizens to choose their leaders through free and regular elections, organized in accordance with the rule of law, with guarantees of political freedom, and limits on the prerogatives of the military" (Karl, 1990: 165).

In terms of content and practice, citizenship theoretically will experience its phase of greatest growth within a democratic context. To take as an example the area of human rights, can it really be said that the formal return to political pluralism has put an end to the long dark days during which such rights were severely abused? Studies might help to ascertain, in this specific field, such things as the rate of resort to the courts and more precisely the number of cases of human rights violations that are prosecuted. Indicators for measuring democracy and the principle public liberties, such as those developed by Freedom House, compiled over many years, can also be useful.

3. Transition

In terms of the shift from authoritarianism to democracy, the concept of the transition or interval between one political regime and another was given respectability (the move from a feudal society to a capitalist society, the move to socialism) by Karl Marx, with whom the concept is generally associated, but also by Max Weber (1978: 1085-1090). Adam Przeworski suggests thinking of the transition from an authoritarian system to a democratic system as "consisting of two simultaneous processes that are at the same time

autonomous up to a certain point: a process in which the authoritarian regime disintegrates, which often takes the form of liberalization, and a process whereby democratic institutions emerge" (Przeworski, 1986: 56). The author adds that all of these transformations are shaped by the particular features of the former regime (its length, its degree of authoritarianism), but that at a certain point specifically democratic institutions must be established. It is important, therefore, to analyze democracy as the final goal or end of these transformations. Yet such an outcome is not guaranteed, in the sense that transformations may consist of a return to an authoritarian regime, or to the emergence of a revolutionary alternative.

O'Donnell and Schmitter stress certain characteristics of transition periods that illustrate clearly the political reality of African countries since 1990. The rules of the political game are not only not defined but they are constantly changing and are sharply contested. The same is true with electoral, institutional and political dogma, constituting a democratic Vulgate that has marked the past decade nearly everywhere, recurrently and often violently (as in Togo). Protagonists do not fight each other merely to satisfy their immediate interests or those of the groups they seek to represent, but also to define the rules and procedures, the civic relationships, that will determine who will be the winners and losers of tomorrow. These two authors also point out that "during the transition, whatever effective rules and procedures there may be will tend to be in the hands of authoritarian leaders. To a lesser or greater extent, depending on the case and the stage of the transition, these leaders retain discretionary power over arrangements and laws that, in a stable democratic system, should be solidly protected by the Constitution and by various independent institutions." (O'Donnell and Schmitter, 1986: 6). The experiences with transition in Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon (Clark and Gardinier, 1997), in Kenya, in Tanzania, etc., can be cited here. At this point, we must focus on the features that are specific to transition in African countries, and which can explain in part the errors, the stumbling blocks, and the backtracking that were recently apparent, for example, in Côte d'Ivoire. For the first time in history, some countries must proceed at the same time through a dual transition, political and economic, moving from authoritarianism to democracy and from "command economies" to a market economy (Graham, 1994).

4. Liberalization

Liberalization should be understood as the process for giving effect to rights that protect both individuals (habeas corpus, secrecy of the mails and protection of privacy, the right to a fair and equitable trial in accordance with pre-established laws, freedom of movement, of expression, of petition, etc.) and social groups (freedom of association, lack of censure in the media, freedom to challenge or express collective disagreement with government policies) (O'Donnell and Schmitter, 1986: 7). There is not necessarily any logical sequence between these groups of rights but, generally speaking, individual rights will be restored before guarantees for collective action are recognized. Moreover, progress in these areas is not irreversible. On the contrary, a characteristic of the initial stage of the transition is its heavy dependence on a State power that remains arbitrary and

capricious, as we have seen in Togo and in Zaire, now the Democratic Republic of Congo (Clark and Gardinier, 1997).

5. Democratization

According to O'Donnell and Schmitter, democratization refers to "processes whereby the rules and procedures of citizenship are applied to political institutions that were formerly subject to other principles (coercive controls, social tradition, expert judgment or administrative fiat), or are extended to include persons who formerly enjoyed no such rights and duties (women, youth, illiterate persons, ethnic minorities, resident foreigners, etc.), or are broadened to cover objects and institutions that were formerly not subject to citizen participation (state agencies, military establishments, political parties, interest groups, businesses, educational institutions, etc.)" (Andrews, 1991, Bader, 1995, Dryzek, 1996, Phillips, 1991).

These two authors note that, as with liberalization, there does not seem to be any logical sequence to these processes, and that democratization is not irreversible. There are obviously linkages between liberalization and democratization, but these two concepts are far from being synonymous, despite the close historical relationship between them (O'Donnell and Schmitter, 1986: 9-11). Without the first, the second would be a mere formality and without the second, the first would fall easy prey to manipulation by rulers. Yet to the extent that the two do not appear simultaneously during the transition process, one may exist without the other, and this may give rise to what these two authors call "liberalized authoritarianism" and "limited democracy", terms that seem quite apt to a number of African countries at the present time. Adam Przeworski declares that democracy is the "contingent result of conflict" (1988: 59-80), and he insists, quite rightly, on the uncertainty that is the most important characteristic of the process of transition towards democracy. As he puts it, "democratization is a process whereby all interests are subjected to competition, and uncertainty becomes institutionalized" (1988: 63).

6. Consolidation

The consolidation of democracy (Przeworski, 1991: 26; Mainwaring et al. 1992; Tulchin and Romero, 1995) presupposes that political institutions are stabilized, institutionalized or legitimized and in effect made routine, and that the rules of conduct appropriate to a democratic regime are largely internalized. Gunther et al. "consider that a democratic regime is consolidated when all politically significant groups view political institutions as the only vehicle for political contention, and adhere to the rules of the democratic game" (Gunther et al. 1995: 7).

It is very important to recognize that consolidation is not simply the prolongation or continuation of transition. These are distinct concepts, even if in practice they may overlap or coincide at times (Schmitter, 1995: 12). Just as transition processes do not necessarily lead to democracy, because of the characteristic uncertainty inherent in the move from one to the other, it is possible for a democratic regime to be deconsolidated.

The same is true for moves to autocracy and to hybrids that combine features of authoritarian regimes and democratic traits in the form of anocracies (Mansfield and Snyder, 1996: 314 ff.). As Schmitter puts it, then, what is consolidated is not democracy as such, but one form or another of democracy. As he says, "democracy is not inevitable and it is revocable. Democracy is not necessary: it does not fill any function required for capitalism, nor does it respond to any ethical imperative of social change" (1995: 14).

II. Gaps and shortcomings in the literature

There are glaring gaps in the literature on this subject, as can be observed at different levels depending on the issues examined.

A. Ethnicity: material and immaterial spaces of membership and identification.

From the very first works of anthropologists, (some of whom, like Robert Delafosse, were colonial administrators), through the more recent output of various disciplines on ethnic minorities in conflict or at risk (Amselle et al., 1985, Horowitz, 1985, Gurr and Harff, 1994), there have been countless and often highly sophisticated studies on different aspects of ethnic issues in Africa. Similarly, globalization processes have sparked a whole series of papers on the logic (Diaw, 1994) or illusions of identity (Bayart, 1997).

While these works are not focused on the concerns of this study, some of their aspects are very useful. In effect, although they do not specifically stress questions of the rights and duties that traditionally attach to the notion of citizenship or the processes by which it is formed, they do provide essential data on two of its constituent elements.

In the first place, there is the spatial component of citizenship. This refers, first, to the material and territorial spaces on which it is constructed, with the differential processes of assigning identities to residency or to territorial affiliation. Citizenship relates next to immaterial or mental spaces, imaginary facts, assumptions, feelings, fears, that are all involved in the invention of citizenship, in law and in fact, before being distilled in a specific geographic place (Amselle and al, 1985, Painter and Philo, 1995).

The second component of the notion of citizenship in general and in SSA in particular is that of multiple membership or identification (age, gender, family, ethnic group, plan, tribe, community, caste, religion, state, etc.). Each of these identities may be assumed in turn, depending on circumstances and interactions (time and space), or they may all be mobilized simultaneously, reflecting an identity and a culture that are ubiquitous.

These multiple identities, in their processes of formation and in their practices or modes of expression, generate their corollary of exclusion (Lamoureux, 1991, Norton, 1988), of marginalization, of conceptions and relationships with foreigners (Simmel, 1908, Shack, 1978, Shack and Skinner, 1978, Skinner, 1965).

B. From authoritarianism to democracy: shifting the frontiers of politics

The growing body of literature (Akindes, 1996, Bratton, and Van de Walle, 1997, Chole and Ibrahim, 1995, Conac, 1993, Kotoudi, 1993, Ninsin, 1998) devoted to the process of restoring political pluralism is still silent on the question of citizenship as a central factor in the political shifts that are now underway, and which appear in many regards as mechanisms for exclusion (Bader, 1995, Dryzek, 1996). This is all the more surprising if we think for a moment of the recurrent themes of these works:

- Social movements that have helped to shift the frontiers of politics (Mamdani and Wamba-dia-Wamba, 1995).
- Civil society (Monga, 1994).
- Modes of transition (Eboussi Boulaga).
- The rule of law.
- Human rights.
- Constitutions and electoral codes.
- Transitional elections.
- Consolidation of democracy, etc.

Some of these works, particularly those devoted to the rule of law and to human rights, deal very directly with all or a portion of the legal or juridical content (rights and duties) of the notion of citizenship, recalling or formulating the dominant tenets in this area.

As elsewhere (Dalton and Kuechler, 1990, Escobar and Alvarez, 1992, Gamson, 1990, Jenkins and Klandermans, 1995, McAdam et al. 1996, Misch, 1996, Tarrow, 1994, Zald and McCarthy, 1990), the various and more or less violent social upheavals that have preceded, accompanied and sometimes propelled attempts to move from authoritarianism to democracy, and the actual modalities of these transitions, illustrate in reality demands for greater rights, and of course for new obligations, i.e. an extension of the notion of citizenship, which is relatively atrophied under a one-party regime. The works devoted to these movements sometimes analyze, in great detail, the mechanisms for the social construction of citizenship, i.e. the ways in which it is demanded and acquired, values and beliefs and the plans and purposes associated with it at any time. (Bazenguissa-Ganga, 1997, Clark and Gardinier, 1997, Lafargue, 1996, Quantin and Daloz 1996).

Similarly, the electoral studies, although their stress is on rules and procedures, with recurring questions of transparency and regularity, nonetheless discuss forms of participation, ways of exercising citizenship, or forms of learning citizenship (Adjovi, 1998, Africa, 1993, Vol 63, No 3; Barkan, 1993, Bjornlund et al., 1992, Bratton, 1992, de Brito, 1994, Constantin and Lafargue, 1996, Constantin and Quantin, 1992, Conte and Lavenue, 1992, Geisler, 1993, Gyimah-Boadi, 1994, Illiassou and Tidjani, 1994, Jeffries and Thomas, 1993, Kiemdé, 1996, Messiant, 1994, Pilon, 1994, Politique africaine, No 69, March 1998, Otayek, 1996, Quantin, 1994, Tvedten, 1993).

C. Governance

There are fewer works on the issue of good governance. But whether they deal with democratic governance (Hyden and Bratton, 1992, Zartman, 1997) or focus on the resource management dimension, they also suffer from the same shortcomings as the works cited above. Most of these studies share a common characteristic, which is the failure to articulate the structural, organizational and functional dimensions of governance (which in themselves are clearly enough identified) as they relate to citizenship.

On the basis of the foregoing, can we say that there are links between citizenship and governance, and if so what are they? Can citizenship contribute to better governance, and how? Can we not also envision the reverse process, i.e. is good governance not perhaps the best way of reinforcing or expanding citizenship, and do we not therefore have a dialectical relationship between the two?

What are the opportunities for action-oriented research that an analysis of these relationships between citizenship and governance might open?

III. Good governance and "spaces of citizenship"

The relationships between citizenship and governance must be analyzed at two different levels.

The first relates to the practice of governance at different times in the history of African countries. Each of these times is characterized by multiple and differentiated articulations between the material and immaterial spaces of citizenship, its contents (tenets, rights, values and beliefs) and specific interactions between social players and the political community of the time.

The second level relates to the impact that rights, values and civic practice characteristic of citizenship can have on the constituent elements of governance discussed above.

A. Space-time and governance

Citizenship-governance relationships bear the mark of a quadruple heritage.

The first is that of precolonial social and political structures and their particular forms of inclusion and exclusion, specifically of foreigners (Lamoureux, 1991, Shack, 1978, Shack and Skinner, 1978, Skinner, 1965).

The second heritage is that of European colonization in its different variants, British, French and Portuguese, and the ways in which they distributed political rights. The best illustration here is the way in which the people who are colonized by the French moved from the status of "natives" to that of citizen, following 1946.

The next heritage is that of the post-colonial African state in its authoritarian version (either civilian or military) and their ways, to varying degrees violent, of exclusion or marginalization from the material and immaterial spaces of citizenship.

The final heritage is that of the democratization process, or the passage from authoritarianism to democracy which, in theory, should be characterized by the inclusion of groups previously excluded or marginalized, but which often takes the form of exclusion or marginalization (Bader, 1995, Dryzek, 1996), sometimes "soft" (through legislation), sometimes real (economic and social constraints, wars, natural disasters, etc.).

As noted above, the design and implementation of assistance programs in the area of citizenship must take account of a long and heavily burdened civil history, and the different layers of the heritage that have gone to make up the ways of being and acting as citizens.

B. Citizen governance

The areas of dynamic interaction between the constituent elements of good governance and the dimensions of citizenship can be broken down analytically under three headings.

1. The rule of law: citizenship as the demand for rights

The various processes behind the social construction of citizenship, the means or ways of becoming a citizen, such as through social movements of all kinds, the restoration or reinforcement of civil society, are all moves in the direction of the rule of law, and among other duties they impose that of responsibility or accountability. This specific dimension of good governance relies, as we know, on the availability of information, freedom of the press, transparency in the decision-making process, effectiveness in the public management of resources, and mechanisms that force individuals and institutions to be accountable for their conduct.

The problem here is how to conceive and implement assistance programs to empower individuals and groups and to expand citizenship as the foundation of good governance.

We may cite the following specific actions: awareness campaigns on human rights, the functioning of the judicial system, training for judicial personnel (judges, lawyers, etc.), training for specialized journalists, the design and broadcasting of radio and television programs in national languages, the creation of legal clinics, etc.

2. Citizen participation and the legitimacy of political authority

A government's legitimacy, i.e. its sensitivity to popular expectations, depends on the existence of participatory processes and on the consent of the governed. For this reason, the legitimacy of political authority relies on the willingness of the citizenry to participate.

3. Form of regime: citizenship as a goal for society

Citizenship, in light of its social ambiguity as noted above, gives rise to many tenets, values and beliefs, and hence many different expectations. It is in this regard a "school of civics" in the sense that it demands tolerance towards other social players with a public dimension.

Preference should be given to assistance programs intended to foster governance, especially at the local level. Local development-oriented NGOs (clearly targeted for example on women, youth, or people in a specific trade) are, thanks to the civic and social interactions that they generate, excellent places for learning the practices of good governance, which in turn will contribute to developing the skills and attitudes of being citizens, and promoting the rights and values of citizenship.

V. Research topics

On the basis of the foregoing, we offer below a list (by no means exclusive and not necessarily in order of importance) of topics that deserve in-depth empirical research, the results of which could be used as input to a program in support of good governance:

- Citizenship and colonization (rules, evolution, heritages).
- Constitutions, electoral codes and gender relations.
- Comparative studies of nationality codes (mechanisms and empirical data on naturalization).
- Juridical culture (level and method of dissemination and learning).
- The quality of rights and feelings of membership or belonging.
- Traditional forms of empowering the citizenry.
- Social movements and citizenship.
- Democratization and inclusiveness.
- Political participation and citizenship.
- Traditional forms of local governance.
- Good governance and the protection of minorities.
- Regional integration, sovereignty and citizenship.
- Geography and the spatial aspects of citizenship.

References (not translated)